



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/716,464

11/20/2003

Hidehiko Fujiwara

Q78503

6839

23373 7590 05/13/2008
SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
2100 PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE, N.W.
SUITE 800
WASHINGTON, DC 20037

EXAMINER

WONG, XAVIER S

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2616

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

05/13/2008

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/716,464	FUJIWARA ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Xavier Szewai Wong	2616	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 17th January 2008.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-4 and 7-10 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-4 and 7-10 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

- Applicant's Amendment filed 17th January 2008 is acknowledged
- Claims 1 and 2 have been amended with claims 5 and 6 canceled
- Claims 1-4 and 7-10 are still pending in the present application
- This action is made non-final

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time

a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Claims **1 – 4, 9** and **10**, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Waseda et al (JP 2001-54151 A)** in view of **Ranalli et al (US 2003/0076933 A1)**.

Consider claims **1** and **2**, **Waseda et al** disclose a connector *20* (adaptor) that connects a mobile phone *30*, through a PBX *10* and the internet (IP) *100/200* as phone *1*, dialing through mobile phone *30* (therefore, input from mobile phone), to a phone *2* (paragraphs *0011-13* & *0016*; figs. *1, 6, 10* and *11*) wherein: when a call is received to the private phone's number, the connection status of the mobile phone (connected to connector or not) is determined (paragraphs *0053-54*). Nonetheless, **Waseda et al** may not have specifically disclosed a *VoIP* extension section to convert an input telephone number into a telephone number of a private IP telephone corresponding to the input number of the mobile unit and linking a telephone directory of the mobile phone unit and a telephone directory of the IP-PBX. **Ranalli et al** teach a Directory Service (DS) converts "unique identifiers" (such as a standard public mobile number) to a corresponding IP address for e.g. an IP-PBX (paragraph *0039*) as if a VoIP extension line section; and the DS links a standard mobile end user to an IP-PBX by storing the phone numbers or identifiers of the mobile end user and the IP-PBX (paragraphs *0015-16, 0021-22, 0135-136, 0147, 0178*; fig. *5*); in order to recognize both the mobile and the IP-PBX number or identifier, their respective directories (or calling lists) are required to be registered into the DS database, therefore, such function reads on as linking a telephone directory of the mobile phone unit and a telephone directory of the IP-PBX. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was created to implement the features of the DS as taught by **Ranalli et al** to the

adaptor of **Waseda** et al for facilitate and expedite communications between a public (e.g. mobile) phone and a private (e.g. IP-PBX) phone.

Consider claims **3** and **4**, and as applied to claim **2** above, **Waseda** et al, as modified by **Ranalli** et al, disclose when a (private) phone *T11* receives a call, and if the mobile phone connector/adaptor *30* is not connected to the mobile phone, then the call is transferred/forwarded to a designated terminal (phone number) according to a database *D9* inside PBX *10*; else if there is not a designated number, then the call is transferred/forwarded to the mobile phone *30* (paragraphs 0064-65; claim 18; fig. 16).

Consider claims **9** and **10**, and as applied to claims **1** and **2**, though **Waseda** et al, as modified by **Ranalli** et al, did not explicitly mention a battery charger for the mobile phone – **Waseda** et al disclose a “current source” (power supply 25) inside the adaptor *20* that can draw power from the PBX (paragraph 0049; fig. 6) – the examiner takes official notice that it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to incorporate the teachings of an adaptor comprising a battery charger for a mobile phone to act as an alternative power source for the mobile phone.

Claims **7** and **8** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Waseda** et al (**JP 2001-54151 A**) in view of **Ranalli** et al (**US 2003/0076933 A1**), as applied to claims **1** and **2**, in further view of **Keenan et al** (**U.S 6,577,631 B1**).

Consider claims **7** and **8**, and as applied to claims **1** and **2**, **Waseda et al**, as modified by **Ranalli** et al, disclose the claimed invention except the adaptor comprising a QoS controller for

Art Unit: 2616

minimizing audio data loss due to congestion over an IP network. **Keenan et al** disclose a User Terminal Equipment (UTE) adapter, which is compatible to be inserted into a digital (mobile) phone, comprising controlling mechanism for Quality of Service (QoS) characteristics such as audio and video delay sensitive information when congestion occurs in an Internet/Ethernet (IP) access environment (col. 1 lines 36-53, col. 5 lines 60-66, col. 7 lines 4-25, col. 8 lines 46-66, col. 10 lines 9-23 & col. 23 lines 50-57; figs. 3 & 4). It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to incorporate the teachings of an adaptor comprising a QoS controller, as taught by **Keenan et al**, in the adaptor of **Waseda et al**, as modified by **Ranalli et al**, in order to minimize audio/video data loss and long delays due to congestion over an IP/Ethernet network.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims **1** and **2** have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

Any response to this Office Action should be **faxed to (571) 273-8300 or mailed to:**

Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Hand-delivered responses should be **brought to:**

Customer Service Window
Randolph Building
401 Dulany Street

Alexandria, VA 22314

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Xavier Wong whose telephone number is (571) 270-1780. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday 8 am - 5 pm (EST).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Seema Rao can be reached on (571) 272-3174. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (571) 273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at (866) 217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call (800) 786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or (571) 272-1000.

Xavier Szewai Wong
X.S.W/x.s.w
28th April 2008

/Seema S. Rao/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2616